UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2977 (Part II) (closed-resumption 2)
16 February 1991

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING (PART II) (closed-resumption 2)

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 16 February 1991, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. MUMBENGEGWI	(Zimbabwe)
Members:	Austria	Mr. HOHENFELLNER
	Belgium	Mr. NOTERDAEME
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ecuador	Mr. AYALA LASSO
	France	Mr. BLANC
	India	Mr. GHAREKHAN
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

91-60384/A 4490V (E)

The meeting was resumed at 11.40 a.m. on Saturday, 16 February 1991

The PRESIDENT: Members of the Security Council have before them documents S/22231, S/22232 and S/22233, containing, respectively, the text of three draft resolutions submitted by Cuba.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/22223, letter dated 14 February 1991 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Algeria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/22227, letter dated 14 February 1991 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/22228, letter dated 15 February 1991 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/22229, note verbale dated 15 February 1991 from the Permanent Mission of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/22230, letter dated 15 February 1991 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; S/22235, letter dated 15 February 1991 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; and S/22237, letter dated 14 February 1991 from the Permanent Representatives of Algeria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): Permit me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for the month of February. It gives my delegation great pleasure to see you in the Chair, especially in view of the close and friendly relations that exist between Zimbabwe and Pakistan. Your rich diplomatic experience and skills are certain to ensure that the Council's deliberations will be guided to a productive and successful outcome.

My delegation would also wish to pay a tribute to His Excellency Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, the Permanent Representative of Zaire, for the skilful manner in which he presided over the work of the Council during the month of January 1991.

Pakistan has from the outset opposed the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Pakistan's position and that of the international commmunity of seeking an Iraqi withdrawal from the brotherly Muslim country of Kuwait has been based on upholding fundamental principles of international law and inter-State conduct. International peace and security and the sovereign independence of small and vulnerable States depend on the respect for these principles, which are reflected in the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States. It is regrettable that in spite of the numerous appeals by world leaders, including the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Iraq could not be persuaded to agree to the withdrawal of its forces from Kuwait.

On its part, the Government of Pakistan made a number of efforts to avert the conflict. In October last year Pakistan joined five other Asian Islamic countries in calling upon President Saddam Hussein to withdraw Iraqi troops from

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Kuwait in the true Islamic spirit and for the unity and solidarity of the Ummah. The trilateral meeting of the Foreign Ministers of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey held on 3 January 1991 appealed for a peaceful solution to the crisis through the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. The meeting also requested the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to exert all efforts for a peaceful solution, including the possibility of the holding of an emergency meeting of the Conference. Pakistan also endorsed the call by Iran for the holding of an emergency summit meeting of the Conference. The Prime Minister addressed messages to fourteen Heads of State and Government directly involved, impressing upon them the need to find a peaceful solution to the problem. The Prime Minister also sent a direct appeal to President Saddam Hussein to implement the Security Council resolutions and withdraw from Kuwait in order to achieve a peaceful resolution of the crisis and save the Muslim people of the region from a major conflagration.

The Government and the people of Pakistan were therefore deeply shocked and anguished at the outbreak of hostilities between Iraq and the multinational forces. Pakistan has consistently called for a peaceful resolution of the crisis and is profoundly concerned that the efforts for a peaceful solution have failed.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mian Mohammad Nawaz Sharif, accordingly undertook a peace mission to Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia from 22 to 28 January 1991. He subsequently visited Libya, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, and yesterday was in Taif for an exchange of views with the Emir of Kuwait, who is the current Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

These strenuous efforts which are being undertaken by the Prime Minister of Pakistan reflect the anguish and the sense of urgency which prevail within the Government and amongst the people of Pakistan at the tremendous loss of valuable lives and destruction of property taking place as a result of the hostilities in the Persian Gulf. Pakistan feels that the current situation is perilous for the entire international community, and for the Muslim Ummah in particular. It is our belief that united efforts by the Muslim Ummah are the best method to meet the present crisis - a crisis which, on the one hand, has made Kuwait the subject of illegal occupation and, on the other hand, has resulted in the devastation and destruction that are now taking place, and the death of innocent citizens through heavy bombing. This has caused the deepest anguish and concern throughout Pakistan, and our hearts bleed for these innocent victims of a relentless war.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Pakistan believes that the solution of the Persian Gulf crisis does not lie in the defeat of any one party, and that the only way to obtain a lasting peace is through understanding. Pakistan is therefore continuing its efforts to organize a conference of Foreign Ministers of the Islamic countries. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has proposed a six-point peace formula which incorporates the following.

First, a declaration of cease-fire on the basis of Iraq's clear expression of its commitment to withdraw troops from Kuwait in implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council;

Second, the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Gulf immediately after the cease-fire, leaving the regional security to be looked after by the countries of the region;

Third, the convening of an emergency session of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to chalk out a unanimous course of action, after taking into consideration all the aspects of the crisis;

Fourth, the deployment of Pan-Islamic forces in the affected area;

Fifth, the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions, which should not be limited to Kuwait only but should also include Kashmir and Palestine with the same force and vigour;

Sixth, until a cease-fire is declared, all the holy places in Saudi Arabia and Iraq should be declared peace zones so that there is no risk of their desecration.

My delegation would wish to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts during this long and difficult crisis. His deep commitment to the cause of peace has left a profound impression in my country.

My delegation has noted with great interest the announcement made by the Revolutionary Council in Baghdad yesterday, to which the initial reaction of my Government was expressed in a statement today. It reads:

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

"Commenting on the statement by the Revolution Command Council of Iraq broadcast by Radio Baghdad, the Foreign Office spokesman stated that while so far the official text of the statement was not available, the Government of Pakistan feels that the offer to accept Security Council resolution 660 was an encouraging opening and a ray of hope for a peaceful solution of the war in the Persian Gulf. The spokesman recalled that Security Council resolution 660 demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

"The spokesman pointed out that the Prime Minister had just returned from the second leg of his peace mission, during which his discussions with the leaders of the Islamic countries had focused on the need for an urgent and peaceful solution to the Gulf crisis in order to avoid bloodshed and devastation caused by the war in the Gulf."

My delegation also attaches great importance to the initiative taken by President Gorbachev and the talks which are scheduled to take place in Moscow in the immediate future. There are encouraging indications that recourse to diplomacy is still the most effective manner of arriving at a peaceful solution.

It is the sincere prayer and hope of my delegation that the Security Council will continue to exercise its collective wisdom and effort in an endeavour to bring about peace in a troubled region where there has already been so much death and destruction. No words can adequately describe the feelings of anguish and outrage among the people of Pakistan. My delegation will work closely with the Security Council for the purpose of securing a just, honourable and durable peace.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. LAGU (Sudan): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. I wish you every success during your presidency at this difficult time. Allow me also to commend the efforts of your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Permanent Representative of Zaire, for his excellent performance last month. My delegation also welcomes and congratulates the new members of the Security Council.

The Government of the Republic of the Sudan strongly supports the call for an immediate cease-fire in order to give peace another chance. In this regard the Sudan joins and commends the initiatives of the Arab Maghreb Union, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, and the recent move taken by the USSR. Sudan commends the persistent endeavours by Yemen and Cuba towards the same goal.

Let me state categorically from the outset that Sudan stands by the independence and sovereignty of the State of Kuwait and that Sudan regrets the occupation of that country and the misery its people now face. However, Sudan equally deplores the presence of the foreign troops in the Gulf. Sudan believes this crisis could have been handled, and can still be handled, within an Arab and Islamic context.

Sudan believes that the prime role of the United Nations, and indeed of the Security Council, is the preservation of peace, security and stability, as stipulated in the Charter. In this context, any actions carried out in the name of the United Nations or on its behalf should be constantly supervised and reviewed by the United Nations, as any deviation from this principle may tempt the parties involved to go beyond the mandate of the United Nations.

(Mr. Lagu, Sudan)

Sudan feels that Iraq is currently being subjected to an unfair, excessive campaign, launched under the banner of the United Nations, in operations that seem not to discriminate between military and civilian targets. Consequently, such operations will inevitably lead to the utter destruction of the economic, cultural and scientific infrastructures and the human resources of the country. The tragic incident of the civilian shelter witnessed three days ago is a testimony to this fact. Sudan fears that the purpose of the present campaign goes beyond the liberation of Kuwait. Rather, it aims at crippling the national capabilities of Iraq and at the subjugation of its people under total humiliation.

Sudan appeals for an immediate cessation of hostilities and calls for the commencement of a new diplomatic endeavour to lead to the realization of a peaceful handling of the Gulf crisis. My delegation is thrilled by the ray of hope that appeared yesterday morning from the Iraqi horizon. We request Iraq to raise and beam that ray of hope more visibly. We hope that the other side will reciprocate in good faith and halt the bombing, allowing the dust to settle and the ray of hope to develop and take shape.

In view of the recent commitment by Iraq to abide by resolution 660 (1990), my delegation brings to the attention of this body the elements contained in the joint statement of 29 January, 1991 by United States Secretary of State Mr. James Baker and USSR Foreign Minister Mr. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, to the effect that any commitment on the part of Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait will lead to the cessation of hostilities and the consideration of a wider peace package in the entire Middle East region. According to The New York Times of 31 January, the two Ministers:

"continue to believe that a cessation of hostilities would be possible if Iraq would make an unequivocal commitment to withdraw from Kuwait".

My delegation therefore appeals to the Security Council to consider this possibility and to interpret the Iraqi signal constructively.

(Mr. Lagu, Sudan)

In conclusion, my Government regrets the ongoing war and fervently calls for an immediate halt of the hostilities in order to allow reason to prevail, and for a comprehensive, peaceful approach in considering this particular tragic and unfortunate crisis and all other problems pending in the entire Middle East region.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Sudan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MONTAÑO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to begin, Sir, by expressing my delegation's pleasure at seeing you preside over the Council during the month of February. It is clear that in the brief time you have spent at the Organization you have earned the appreciation and respect of your colleagues. I also wish to extend my congratulations to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Zaire, and to the new members of the Council.

The Government of Mexico has been following with great concern the developments in the Persian Gulf. Together with all the States of the international community, we recognize that this situation does not involve that region alone. Its implications and effects have had, have and will continue to have profound repercussions on all of us, even on those who find themselves geographically distant from the area of conflict. That is why we have decided to participate constructively in the search for a just and peaceful solution.

The same concern was duly expressed last October by the Rio Group at the meeting of Heads of State held in Caracas. The assessment of the situation in the Persian Gulf was more recently discussed during the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Rio Group also held in Caracas on 28 January, in which our countries reaffirmed their readiness to make an effective contribution to the advent of a new peace order in that region.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

For reasons of principle, law and history, Mexico categorically rejects the invasion and claimed annexation of Kuwait by Iraq. This aggression violates the principles of international coexistence. Therefore, we support resolution 660 (1990), adopted by the Security Council on the very day of the invasion. From the outset, we joined in the demand that Iraq withdraw all its forces from the territory of Kuwait.

We profoundly regret that the diplomatic efforts to resolve a dispute between neighbouring countries, with long and profound ties of unity and brotherhood binding them, have failed. The situation is even more regrettable if we consider the harm caused to the people of Kuwait and that now being suffered by the people of Iraq, as well as the negative impact that the war has had on all countries and certainly more severely on developing countries.

Our support for the Security Council resolutions and for the Secretary-General is based on our conviction that therein lies one of the best opportunities to promote a solution to the conflict that would enable the re-establishment of peace in accordance with international law. We are also convinced of the need to undertake multilateral efforts aimed at a comprehensive, peaceful and definitive solution to the problems of that region. The Secretary-General has a fundamental role to play in this process, which my Government recognizes, in order to ensure that the process is fully carried out.

The beginning of hostilities created situations alarming to us all. The extension of the conflict through the condemnable attacks on non-belligerent countries of the area and the potential for regional destabilization add an irrational dynamic to the conflict that should not diminish the determination of those within the United Nations who, like us, are convinced that a peaceful solution should be found as soon as possible. We should not delude ourselves: as the war continues, new sources of conflict will begin to develop from its wounds.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

The broad human and material losses caused thus far by the hostilities in the region, which have gravely harmed women and children, compel us all firmly to support the efforts coordinated by the Secretary-General to bring relief to the affected civilian population, and we must ponder other options within the reach of the international community to deal properly with the humanitarian aspects of the situation.

We therefore call upon all parties to the conflict to show the greatest possible restraint while hostilities continue, thus minimizing loss of life and damage to the economic, social and ecological infrastructure of the countries of the area. We join in the Secretary-General's appeal that under no circumstances should chemical weapons or other weapons of mass destruction be used. We also call for continued efforts to find a diplomatic solution to the conflict. No compromise or concession would be more costly than the devastation of war.

We know full well that it is not easy to break the vicious circle of intransigence and inflexibility, but we stress our conviction that it is still possible to find peace through dialogue and negotiation. It is in the interests of all to find the means to safeguard a world order in which potential conflicts can be dealt with through international law.

Another universal concern is that the economic consequences of this action be prevented from severely damaging hopes for the recovery of countries in an unending struggle to overcome the obstacles to our full development. It is our responsibility to prevent the Gulf conflict from becoming a new barrier to the advancement of developing countries to economic and social equity, lest our countries enter again into a cycle with negative effects on our peoples, which we know from experience would only generate new conflicts. The international order to which we all aspire will be a mere illusion unless it is based on meaningful progress in the well-being of the great majority of the world population.

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

Diplomacy fails only in self-defeat. On 2 August 1990 the United Nations reacted with the efficiency we had all expected of it. In the months that followed, and despite enormous difficulties, the Organization took important steps to ensure that international peace and security should prevail over ruthlessness. No one can doubt that there were numerous efforts at a diplomatic solution to the conflict, and we remain convinced that even now, when pessimism is more in evidence than hope, it will still be possible to find a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

Surely, it is ironic that resolution 678 (1990) both opened the way for diplomacy and legitimized the actions we are now witnessing. My delegation considers that this reality should not exclude conciliatory diplomatic efforts. We consider that continuing to take steps towards a peaceful solution to the conflict which began on 2 August 1990 would not run counter to the provision of resolution 678 (1990), which authorizes States

"to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions" (resolution 678 (1990), para. 2).

The Security Council should consider a broader debate on the way in which the actions it has authorized are being conducted and should not shirk its primary mandate under the Charter to maintain international peace and security. The benefits of using the international democracy this Organization represents would greatly outweigh a unity based on silence or indifference. We must consider and encourage new proposals. Without losing sight of the main objective of the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, let us again give peace a chance to be restored in the near future.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mexico for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on the remarkable way in which you have been conducting the work of the Council during this very difficult month. I also pay a tribute to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Zaire, Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, for the outstanding diplomatic skill he displayed while presiding over the Council in the month of January.

My delegation has asked to speak in order to record its position at this critical juncture in the post-War history of the Middle East. The present crisis is a direct consequence of the invasion and annexation of Kuwait by Iraq. Turkey has stated clearly that this unprecedented violation of the Charter of the United Nations is totally unacceptable. Iraq's actions have created concern and outrage, and its subsequent intransigence has brought about the tragic war we are all witnessing today. All the diplomatic efforts that were made in the period preceding 16 January, including the final, very commendable, effort of the Secretary-General when he made his trip to Baghdad last month, have been rebuffed by the Iraqi leadership. When a peaceful resolution of the crisis became impossible war became inevitable. There is no way for the Iraqi régime to evade this responsibility. The Iraqi Government is responsible not only for the war that is raging in the Gulf; it is responsible also for the ordeal of the people of Kuwait, who have been brutalized and terrorized by the army of occupation. Iraq also bears full responsibility for the enormous economic damage done to all the countries of the region, and indeed beyond the region. My country is among those that have been seriously affected by the economic consequences of the Gulf crisis.

The loss of life and the massive destruction we are witnessing are a source of profound sadness for us in Turkey. We sympathize deeply with the suffering Iraqi people, who cannot be held responsible for the invasion of Kuwait or the subsequent

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

actions which have inexorably led to armed conflict. The régime in Baghdad has it within its power to end this war. It must do what is morally imperative and act without any further delay.

We are following with close interest the various peace initiatives and diplomatic contacts undertaken in recent days by a number of countries. We have to underline that these peace initiatives cannot succeed without Iraq's agreeing to comply fully and unconditionally with the relevant Security Council resolutions. It is our earnest hope that good sense, wisdom and statesmanship will prevail and that Iraq will pull out of Kuwait so that hostilities can be brought to an early end. If Baghdad is able to show the courage to take this fateful step, it will have contributed to the restoration of international legality, and will have helped bring to an end the suffering of the Kuwaiti as well as the Iraqi peoples.

Such a restoration of international legality can be a first step towards the re-establishment of peace and security throughout the Middle East. That in turn would allow the human and material resources of the region to be devoted to the reconstruction and development of the region.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Turkey is prepared to contribute to the efforts that will be jointly undertaken to bring about a peaceful, stable and secure environment in the region as soon as the present crisis has been overcome. Turkey hopes that the crisis will be rapidly resolved with the least possible suffering and destruction. Turkey also wishes to see Iraq assuming its rightful place as a respected and responsible member of the community of nations, its territorial integrity intact, making its contribution to co-operation and peaceful coexistence in a very sensitive part of the world.

We appeal once again to the Government of Iraq to heed the call of the United Nations and to comply fully and promptly with the Security Council's resolutions.

The PRESIDENT: I thank tne representative of Turkey for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ELIASSON (Sweden): Let me first of all join others in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We have deep respect for you personally as well as for your country. Allow me also to express to Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya our appreciation of his skilful leadership of the Council during the month of January.

After eight long years of war between Iran and Iraq, a new tragedy is now unfolding in the Persian Gulf region. Its origin is Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. This war started on 2 August last year, when Iraq attacked its smaller neighbour, a loyal Member of the United Nations.

It is a tragedy for Kuwait and for the Kuwaiti and Iraqi peoples, but it is also an issue of fundamental importance to all of us. The security and sovereignty of all States are at stake. Solidarity and the vision of collective security are basic pillars of the United Nations.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

Sweden's position has been crystal-clear from the start. The invasion and the subsequent annexation of Kuwait are grave violations of the most fundamental principles of international law. Conflicts between States shall be solved by peaceful means, and the acquisition of territory by force can under no circumstances be accepted.

As a Member of the United Nations Sweden supports all Security Council resolutions on the Iraq-Kuwait situation, including resolution 678 (1990). Our support is based on the principle that an ultimate aim for the United Nations is to uphold international peace and security. The fulfilment of this aim may require, as a last resort, in accordance with the Charter, the use of force when other measures are inadequate.

We had hoped that the resolutions would help bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of international legality. We regret the situation that developed after 15 January, but by agreeing to withdraw from Kuwait Iraq could have brought an end to the escalating crisis. We are sad to see the failure of diplomacy leading to casualties and to the suffering of a great number of people.

It is now essential that a speedy end to the war be reached on the basis of the United Nations resolutions and international law. We welcome the initiatives undertaken by the Soviet Union, Iran and others.

We understand from the declaration in Baghdad yesterday that Iraq may be ready to comply with resolution 660 (1990) and withdraw from Kuwait. Evidently, that declaration has to be further clarified, but one thing is clear: in accordance with resolution 660 (1990), Iraq has to withdraw unconditionally. If, in unequivocal terms, Iraq would demonstrate its preparedness to comply without conditions with the demands of the Security Council, a cessation of hostilities tied to a complete and rapid withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait should be considered. Thus, the seriousness of the Iraqi intentions would be put to a test.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

In our view the Security Council should continue carefully to monitor developments in the conflict. No openings for a peaceful solution that could lead to the implementation of United Nations resolutions should be overlooked. It should be perfectly clear that resolution 678 (1990) does not authorize the use of military means for purposes that go beyond what the United Nations has determined. It is important, furthermore, to uphold the respect for humanitarian law and for the laws of armed conflict.

How the conflict is going to be brought to an end is of utmost importance for the future of the region and its relations with the rest of the world. This will also affect the role of the United Nations on the world stage and the quality of international cooperation after the cold war.

The United Nations and its Secretary-General have a prominent role to play in preparing for the post-war situation. The Secretariat is, as we understand, already planning for the possibility of a peace-keeping operation after Iraq has withdrawn from Kuwait.

The United Nations will also have to carry the burden with regard to humanitarian needs following the war. That formidable task has to be well prepared. Even as the war is going on, the United Nations system has to face many pressing humanitarian challenges. The forthcoming visit to Iraq by representatives of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) could indeed be very valuable.

Sweden will continue to assist the affected population through emergency relief in cooperation with the United Nations, the Red Cross and various Swedish private organizations.

After Iraq has withdrawn from Kuwait, the United Nations, in cooperation with the countries of the region, should also play an active role in the efforts to establish arrangements for regional security and stability in the Persian Gulf area.

(Mr. Eliasson, Sweden)

Furthermore, the Palestinian problem has to be urgently addressed by the United Nations in the post-war period. Unless we enter a genuine peace process to accommodate the legitimate claims of the Palestinian people the Middle East will continue to be plagued by instability after the end of the Iraq-Kuwait conflict.

In the post-war period the United Nations should also actively contribute to a serious discussion about armaments in the larger Middle East region.

But the basic and most immediate question is: Shall the force of law or the law of force prevail? Iraq has to leave Kuwait. That is a fundamental requirement for international peace and security based on respect for United Nations resolutions and international law.

Let there be no doubt: the key to ending the tragedy taking place in front of us is in the hands of President Saddam Hussein.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sweden for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia): I wish merely to make a short intervention in response to the questions addressed to me by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on Thursday.

Sir David asked me:

"First, what is the nature of the military threat which Iraq has represented to Saudi Arabia since 2 August and represents today? Secondly, has Saudi Arabia received any indications, directly or indirectly, of Iraq's readiness to comply with Security Council resolutions ...?" (S/PV.2977 (Part II) (closed), p. 79)

Both are important questions, to which I gladly respond.

The Council knows that before Iraq invaded Kuwait there was an abundance of threats, then military movements and then armies positioned in offensive formations on Kuwait's border. Our surveillance facilities showed the whole picture. Other countries' surveillance facilities also showed the picture.

Our Kuwaiti brethren were worried. We were worried. But we had assurances, specific assurances, from the leadership in Iraq. We had them, our King had them, our Government had them and the President of Egypt personally had them also. The leaders of many countries personally had assurances from the Iraqi leadership that Kuwait would not be invaded.

On 2 August Kuwait, to our shock, was invaded, while negotiations were in progress, six hours after the suspension of a meeting in Jiddah in the negotiating session between the Vice-President of Iraq and the Crown Prince of Kuwait.

A few days later the same formations - 120,000 soldiers strong - were positioned on the borders of Saudi Arabia in the same offensive formation, and our military commanders reported that it was an offensive exercise. We had the same assurances as Kuwait had had, that Saudi Arabia was not threatened, as if the soldiers were only there for the weekend, probably on a pleasure trip.

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

I think that we should have been very stupid to take those assurances seriously, having already seen what Kuwait had been subjected to, after all the assurances that we had received. Therefore, there was no question in our minds about what that threat meant.

I do not wish to add to that the information we had from other eminent Arab sources about secret designs to which they were privy concerning the intentions of the Iraqi leadership for Saudi Arabia in particular. There was no question in our minds but that Iraq had the same offensive designs as it had had towards Kuwait, and there was no choice but to take the defensive measures that Saudi Arabia took.

I do not think that any responsible leadership in the world would have undertaken the responsibility of leaving its country without all the necessary measures to defend it under those circumstances. Anybody who claims that Saudi Arabia should have taken a different course is simply not responsible for Saudi Arabia, and simply does not appreciate what should be the responsibility of a leadership towards its people and its country.

We know today the preparations made by the Iraqi forces since the end of the Iran-Iraq war. Iraq simply liquidated all its gains to put an end to that war. Iraq's military preparations, which are clear today, show what kind of designs Iraq had for the area.

I hope that that satisfies Sir David on the first question.

As to the second question, whether we have had any indications, directly or indirectly, that Iraq is ready to comply with Security Council resolutions, we certainly have not had any more indications than members of the Council have had.

The last indication, yesterday, in which the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council set more conditions for the Security Council to comply with than the Security Council resolutions have demanded of Iraq, unfortunately does not augur

(Mr. Shihabi, Saudi Arabia)

well for a peaceful settlement. A pause of five and a half months was given for a peaceful settlement; after the war was initiated on 2 August the Security Council waited until 15 January, with a full pause, for the Iraqi leadership to comply with Security Council resolutions. That is why I am surprised when people ask for a pause now. Was not a pause of five and a half months enough?

Is a statement in which Kuwait is not mentioned any serious indication? Evacuation is mentioned as one of the elements that could be, sort of, discussed. That is no indication to us of peace. In a state of war, a difficult war in which people are suffering so much, many people from more than one country - Iraq and Kuwait, and today Saudi Arabia is also suffering - indications of peace cannot be a passing mention of evacuation.

Such an indication would be the way in which Iraq dealt with Iran when it wanted to settle their problem. In one letter the President of Iraq settled the question with Iran. That is how to settle the matter today, if the Iraqis really mean to stop the war. Otherwise, any indications would be just unfortunate exercises at the expense of people wh are exposed, not people who are safe in the bunkers.

I hope I have answered the second question.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Kuwait, on whom I now call.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): The reason I have asked to speak today is to answer the questions put to me by my friend the Permanent Representative of the United States. Before doing so, I should like to read out for the Council the statement issued by my Government following the Iraqi communiqué reported by the media yesterday concerning the so-called Iraqi acceptance of withdrawal from Kuwait, as follows:

"The media reports on the communiqué issued by the Iraqi regime today, which contains its conditions for withdrawal from Kuwait, adds nothing new to reversing the intransigent Iraqi position. It is to be considered as one link in the chain of the policy of deception, prevarication and procrastination Iraq has followed since its evil invasion of Kuwait. It is a repetition of its attempts and desperate manoeuvres to circumvent the resolutions of the Security Council and to break the isolation imposed on that regime and drive a wedge in the international unanimity against its brutal occupation of Kuwait.

"Kuwait reiterates its clear and firm position: the full and unconditional implementation of all the Security Council resolutions relevant to the question of Kuwait. Kuwait demands that the attention of the world be drawn to the tragedy of the Kuwaiti people, which has stood steadfast on the territory of Kuwait since 2 August last, to the suffering of our children, prisoners of war and those held in detention camps, and to the plight of those who are exposed to torture and murder at the hands of the forces of the treacherous Iraqi regime.

"Kuwait - while calling upon the international community to continue its firm action to put an end to the bitter situation suffered by the people of

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Kuwait and intensify its serious efforts to compel the Iraqi regime to comply with all the relevant Security Council resolutions unconditionally and restore legality in a manner conducive to the establishment of security and stability in the region and to strengthening the foundations of the new world order to make the world safe, secure and stable - calls upon the brotherly Iraqi people to stand united against injustice and the tyrant and rid Iraq of its tyrannical leadership whose warped policies have led to many catastrophes the first victims of which were Iraq and Iraqi citizens and to grave consequences that have brought destruction and disunity to the Arab and Islamic Ummah."

With regard to diplomatic efforts that might be undertaken following the issuance of the Iraqi communiqué, my country's position is to welcome and encourage such efforts in order to seek further clarification of the Iraqi position and to bring to bear further pressure on Iraq to cancel the unreasonable and unacceptable conditions contained in its communiqué of yesterday.

At the same time, we do not agree with emerging calls, particularly those from some members of the Security Council, to the effect that a temporary partial or comprehensive cease-fire be declared in order to give ongoing diplomatic endeavours a chance to bear fruit. Diplomatic endeavours have been constant since the initiation of hostilities. Iraqi envoys have travelled abroad and foreign envoys have gone to Baghdad for negotiations, most recently the envoy of the Soviet President. We welcome and encourage these efforts and we wish them to continue in the same manner without any need to introduce another element, that is, a cease-fire, before complete Iraqi compliance with the Security Council resolutions is achieved.

On the contrary, we believe that, while there are some who say that there is some change in the Iraqi position, that change has been brought about by the use of

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

force against the Iraqi leadership. Regrettably, force seems to be the only language understood by the Iraqi regime.

That is our position concerning the current diplomatic endeavours.

I shall now take up the questions posed to me by the representative of the United States. The first is: "What are the efforts that were made by Kuwait to arrive at a negotiated solution on a border demarcation with Iraq before 2 August?" The border agreement between Iraq and Kuwait was signed in 1963 by the former President of Iraq, Mr. Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr, and the late Amir of Kuwait, Sheikh al-Sabah al-Salem al-Sabah.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

That agreement was deposited at the time with the United Nations. After that, Kuwait called upon Iraq, through its very-high-level bilateral contacts, through its Ambassador to Baghdad and the Iraqi Ambassador to Kuwait, to establish the technical commissions that had been agreed upon when the agreement was signed for the purpose of the demarcation of the boundaries.

As the Council is well aware, the agreement concluded in 1963 very clearly defined the boundaries between the countries; it is called the League of Arab States line. It was left to the technical commissions to place the boundary markings on the ground, in conformity with the agreement.

Very regrettably, for three years after that Iraq used excuse after excuse to evade the establishment of these commissions - pretexts such as concern over internal questions in Iraq and the developments and changes taking place in Iraq. Sometimes it used the pretext that there were no differences whatsoever on this matter and therefore there was no need to hurry.

In 1966 Iraq agreed to the establishment of the technical commissions. For two years they met sporadically - very sporadically indeed. Iraq did not take the meetings of these commissions seriously at all. Prevarication, procrastination and evasion were the hallmarks of Iraq's conduct.

From 1968 to 1973 the Iraqi Government carried out various acts of aggression across the border and attempts to infiltrate Kuwait's territory.

In 1973 the Foreign Minister of Kuwait, Sheikh Sabah al-Ahmad, travelled to Baghdad in an attempt to put an end to these acts of aggression. He tried to reactivate the work of the technical commissions. Then, His Highness Emir Sheikh al-Jabar al-Ahmad, at that time the Prime Minister, travelled to Iraq and tried to persuade the Iraqi leadership to take these matters seriously. He attempted to lay new, appropriate groundwork for an understanding and to build confidence within the Iraqi Government. Six co-operation agreements were signed between the two

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

countries. Their aim was to strengthen the ties between the two countries so that the boundaries could be demarcated on the basis of political understanding and co-operation.

The visits continued. Kuwaiti laymen became active. Popular institutions in Kuwait joined with the Government in stating that the situation with Iraq could not continue. Many people's delegations travelled to Iraq and met with officials there. In interviews with the current President of the Iraqi régime, the editors of Kuwaiti newspapers always raised the subject, and invariably the answer was: there is no hurry; you do not have to worry about your boundaries; they are wherever you want them to be - within Iraq. As can be seen, this was a clear case of procrastination.

Then the Iraq-Iran war broke out. It lasted for eight years. During that time Iraq unilaterally terminated the border disputes with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The Kuwaiti Government did not want to raise this matter with Iraq when it was in such a critical situation. Despite the advice of some friendly States and calls from the people, our response was always that Kuwait, which was providing unlimited support to Iraq in the war with Iran, did not want to blackmail Iraq at a time of such great difficulty for it.

Immediately after the end of the war, the Foreign Minister of Kuwait resumed his correspondence with his Iraqi counterpart. The response he received was that the matter had gone beyond the ministerial level and was now on a higher level.

Immediately thereafter, in 1989, His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister visited Iraq. He raised the whole subject of borders with the Iraqi leadership. There was a flat rejection from the Iraqi Government. It was not open to discussion.

A month later, His Highness the Emir personally went to Iraq. He raised the same question and got the same answer: rejection and prevarication.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

But on 15 July 1990 the Iraqi Note was addressed to the League of Arab States. It contained four accusations against Kuwait - all of them baseless. One was that Kuwait did not wish to settle the border question with Iraq.

Two days after the circulation of the Note to the members of the League of Arab States, the Government of Kuwait, for its part, addressed a Note to the League of Arab States in which it called for the establishment of an Arab or international arbitration panel, to be agreed upon between the two parties, to consider the points of disagreement and dispute put forward by the Iraqi Government in its Note. The Arab Presidents actively attempted to avoid escalation of the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait. The Iraqi Government, however, rejected the Kuwaiti proposal for the establishment of an Arab or international arbitration panel. It insisted on bilateral negotiations, between Kuwait and Iraq.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

After the intervention by some Heads of Arab States, the Government of Kuwait agreed to a meeting in Jiddah. As members are well aware, that meeting was at a very high level, and was attended by the Vice-President of the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council and the Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Kuwait.

It was a unique meeting. After his arrival in Jiddah, the Chairman of the Iraqi delegation did not give the impression he was there for a meeting and to discuss points mentioned in a complaint addressed to the League of Arab States. A single meeting was held between His Highness the Crown Prince and the Iraqi side. It was followed by a protocol meeting between the members of the two delegations. The Chairman of the Iraqi delegation said he was indisposed, that he had a headache, and that he wanted to carry out the rituals of Omrah in Holy Mecca, and he evaded the continuation of the meeting.

In order to save what was left of the meetings, Kuwait accepted continuance of them. That happened on the Tuesday and Wednesday. The delegation of Kuwait agreed that the meetings would continue on the Saturday, in Baghdad - that is, two days later, and would be followed by other meetings in Kuwait. That agreement was sponsored by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The two delegations left. Eight hours after that agreement, the Iraqi armed forces marched to swallow Kuwait and attempt to erase it from the map of the world.

Those were our attempts since 1963 concerning the question of the borders.

The second question was this: does the Government of Kuwait accept negotiating with the Government of Iraq after it complies with the elements in paragraph 3 of resolution 660 (1990)? The answer is this. After the adoption of resolution 660 (1990) on 3 August the Government of Kuwait addressed a letter to the Secretary-General, informing him of the State of Kuwait's official acceptance of that resolution. In this Council we declare that after the complete and

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

unconditional withdrawal of the invading Iraqi forces from Kuwait, we are ready to sit with the Iraqi Government to consider all pending matters to solve them by the peaceful means to which Kuwait has always adhered. At the same time we would inform our brothers here that it must be clear in the Iraqi mind that resolution 660 (1990) provides for a complete and unconditional withdrawal. Then, and only then, negotiations would take place to solve the pending problems between two countries by peaceful means.

The third question is this: has Iraq shown readiness to accept any negotiated solution; would it be possible to arrive at a negotiated solution? The answer is that Iraq has occupied Kuwait since 2 August. On 4 August it annexed Kuwait and claimed it was a part of Iraq. The representative of Iraq, who is present here, finds it difficult to say the word "Kuwait". The communiqué which it is claimed indicates Iraq's acceptance of resolution 660 (1990) does not mention the word "Kuwait" at all.

The fourth question is this: do you think a cease-fire would be beneficial in encouraging Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait as provided in the United Nations resolutions? The answer is that I clarified and stated Kuwait's position in my first statement before the Council. We believe a cease-fire, temporary or durable, partial or comprehensive, would be a wrong signal from the Council to the Iraqi Government. It would enable its régime to regroup and again carry out aggression - not only against Kuwait but also against other neighbouring Arab States. That is my answer to the fourth and last question.

The Member States who called for a meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in the Gulf so as to arrive at a cease-fire in order to convince the Iraqi leadership to accept the Security Council's resolutions will perhaps, after reading the Iraqi communiqué, and having heard the statement of the representative

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

of Iraq a few days ago, realize the futility of their efforts. They may have realized that they are indirectly serving the dreams and illusions of the Iraqi régime. The interventions of the Iraqi régime before the Council and the communiqué issued by the Revolutionary Council of Iraq yesterday have not dealt in any way whatsover with its crime against Kuwait, and its occupation and destruction of Kuwait. They speak of a war that they claim was imposed upon them for no reason. They speak of everything other than the main reason for this crisis, which those who called for the convening of the Council call the Gulf crisis. The representative of Iraq finds it difficult to mention Kuwait's name because he knows that Iraq's bitter experience in Kuwait is going to turn their régime upside down and rid their people of it. Afterwards, the Iraqi people will be a free people that devotes its energies to building its economy and achieving prosperity. Placing the blame on the Council is a habitual practice engaged in by all those who have lost the causes of their countries. History is against the régime and against the dictator and challenges him to deal with the essence of the subject: the aggression against Kuwait, a peaceful and secure country.

You can turn a blind eye to the truth, but you cannot hide it from the world.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The whole world is going to restore by force the legitimacy destroyed by your regime. Iraq will be compelled to say the word "Kuwait" and to deal with it. The Kuwaiti people will have another score to settle with you. But it will be magnanimous in its dealings and in its attempts to maintain the bonds of good neighbourliness and ties of blood. It will adhere to the genuine principles of the great religion of Islam.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): My purpose in attending this meeting was to answer the questions addressed to me by Sir David Hannay, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, and by Mr. Vorontsov, the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union.

However, what I have heard in this meeting compels me to refer to the reservations I raised on the first day of this meeting concerning its transformation into a private session for liars, pygmies and hypocrites. Earlier, we heard one respected representative calling for international legitimacy and Iraq's immediate withdrawal from Kuwaiti territory. I do not hesitate to say the name of Kuwait, because the territory of Kuwait is dear to us. But we cannot accept traitors in Kuwait. That representative, whose country has been occupying a third of Cyprus over recent years, is now calling upon us to withdraw.

Another dear colleague made unfounded allegations before the Council that Iraq intended to invade his country. His country never mentioned this alleged intention until after the visit of the United States Secretary of Defense there. God only knows what he told them, but they suddenly claimed that Iraq intended to invade Saudi Arabia.

Before answering the pygmy who sits to my right and who tried to provoke me with sadistic words and even called for a coup against the Iraqi regime, I should

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

like to quote some passages from the statement issued yesterday by the presidency of Algeria.

"This massacre reveals the true nature of the war being waged against the Iraqi people, which today has escalated from an operation designed to systematically destroy Iraq's economic and military potential to an actual war of extermination.

"Algeria resolutely denounces the intentions of certain Powers to try to impose their new order by fire and bloodshed. It also denounces the complicity of certain Arab countries, who are thus lending support to a genocidal campaign against a fraternal people".

"...

"Algeria wishes to recall that the intervention by the coalition forces, perpetrated under the cover of international law is, in reality, a campaign of all-out destruction which, through the massacre of innocents, is assuming the dimensions of a crime against humanity" (S/22223, p.2).

I will now be pleased to answer the questions posed by Sir David Hannay on the first day of our meeting. I hope that he will permit me to address some questions to him when I have finished.

As far as I remember, the first question pertained to Iraqi's readiness to withdraw immediately from Kuwaiti territory. I should like to remind Sir David and my colleagues around this table that resolution 660 (1990), which Iraq announced yesterday it is ready to accept, refers to withdrawal from Kuwaiti territory but also refers to immediate and intensive negotiations. Some countries turn a blind eye to that paragraph and concentrate on the former, which proves the correctness of the Iraqi position that all the resolutions of the Security Council should be implemented, and that international legitimacy is indivisible and should not be selectively applied.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

Does Iraq respect the Geneva Conventions? Yes. We respect all the Geneva Conventions. However, I should like to remind my colleague Sir David that the Geneva Conventions are not limited to the treatment of prisoners of war. They also address - in the Fourth Convention in particular - the necessity to protect civilians against the consequences and evils of war. That is why I should like to question Sir David's country's commitment and adherence to the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War.

Concerning our prisoners of wars, they are being well treated. Their safety, health and dignity are guaranteed. The few questions addressed to them on the day they were taken prisoner concerning their names and units are questions approved by the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of prisoners of war. They were shown on Iraqi television only to prove that they were prisoners and that they were alive. However, after some protestations against it, Iraq has since ceased showing prisoners on television.

Where are these prisoners quartered? I do not know. But I can say that their lives are being safeguarded.

Another question of Sir David's concerned whether Iraq was committed not to use chemical weapons. It is. We have said so before. However, even in the original Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, Iraq reserved its right to use them in retaliation for their use. I should like to point out that, since the signing of that Convention, weapons of mass destruction have been comprehensively developed. That is why we regard chemical weapons as equivalent to nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

If any such weapons are used, Iraq will use them too. If the intensive high-altitude aerial bombardment continues, we shall consider it to be tantamount to the use of weapons of mass destruction.

I hope I have answered all the questions asked of me by the representative of the United Kingdom. Now I have some questions to put to him, and I hope he will be able to reply to them either at this meeting or at a later date.

First, to what extent have the United Kingdom and its allies observed the Fourth Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, particularly in the light of the indiscriminate nature of the bombing by the United States and the United Kingdom, which continues day and night?

Secondly, why did the United Kingdom prevent the shipment of medical supplies previously contracted for by Iraq with British companies even though these are not covered by Security Council resolutions?

Thirdly, to what extent has the United Kingdom observed the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December 1990 prohibiting attacks on nuclear facilities, operational or under construction, and noting that the Security Council would have to impose measures under Chapter VII of the Charter on States that carry out such attacks?

Fourthly, did the British Government take the necessary measures to prevent the spread of radiation when it participated in the attacks on those nuclear facilities?

I hope Sir David will answer those questions.

As to the question of my colleague His Excellency Ambassador Vorontsov about Iraq's readiness to withdraw, I think yesterday's Iraqi initiative and the contacts that will take place next Monday between the Iraqi Foreign Minister and the Soviet authorities will provide a final answer to that question.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

But let me ask a question of the representative of the Soviet Union: Do the Soviet Union and the United States remain committed to their recent communiqué of 30 January 1991?

In conclusion, I wish to state that the Security Council should not permit any person whatsoever - especially one with no national or even personal identity - in this Chamber to attack a State Member of the United Nations or its representative.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): I would not usually intervene again in the same debate, but since I spoke on 14 February there have been a number of new developments: a statement by the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council and the submission of three draft resolutions by the representative of Cuba. I believe it makes sense to comment on these new developments, and also, of course, to address myself to the answers given by the representative of Iraq and to the questions he has put to my Government.

I am glad he answered the questions. I think that has given some sense to the way we are conducting our business here. Although I do not find the answers satisfactory, I am grateful to him for having given them.

The answer he gave me and the representative of the Soviet Union about withdrawal is frankly not really the full answer that is needed if we are to get back on all fours with the Security Council's own resolutions. But I shall come to that, because it is covered in the communiqué of the Revolutionary Command Council. I would just say that it would be so easy to bring a peaceful solution to this crisis if only the representative of Iraq were instructed to reply simply and affirmatively to the question put to him by both myself and the representative of the Soviet Union that, yes, Iraq will withdraw from Kuwait, and will give concrete evidence and take steps to implement that undertaking. All that is needed is a firm commitment to withdraw and the taking of concrete steps implementing it. Unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait is simply not a negotiable item.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

I am grateful for the answers he gave to the very serious humanitarian issue I raised about prisoners of war, although I must say that the answers were in most respects inadequate and unsatisfactory. But I note that he stated categorically and without any ambiguity that Iraq applied the Geneva Conventions in respect of prisoners of war. My Government will certainly expect that in future dealings between the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Government of Iraq that undertaking will be validated. If it is not, I am afraid the representative of Iraq will be left looking very foolish indeed. But I express the hope now that it will be validated and not invalidated, and that the Government of Iraq will now fulfil all its obligations, which include the notification of names and giving the International Committee of the Red Cross access to the prisoners, without any further delay and without any attempt to make conditions or to make linkages with other supposed parts of the Geneva Conventions. But I noted that the representative of Iraq did not make such linkages, did not make such conditions, and my Government will now wait to see whether the Government of Iraq does not indeed make such conditions. We will be very glad if that is so.

I am afraid I have to say that I think the explanation given about the presentation of prisoners of war on television by the Iraqi Government was a quite unsatisfactory one and an unconvincing one. There was absolutely no case for showing them on television; that this is permissible is specifically contradicted in the Geneva Conventions. And of course the Geneva Conventions provide for a perfectly good way of ensuring that the next of kin are aware that their relations are prisoners of war, that is to say by communicating their names and details through the International Committee of the Red Cross. So there was no need whatsoever to use television for that purpose, and I find that explanation unconvincing.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

I note that the prisoners of war are said to be held in safe places. Again, I think that once the International Committee of the Red Cross has been allowed to see the prisoners they will be the best judges of whether the places are safe or not. That will be very necessary. I do not think it makes any sense to try to make a subjective judgement of this. We noted with horror a statement at an earlier stage by the Government of Iraq that the prisoners of war would be placed in areas where they might be involved in the hostilities, in an attempt to distort or influence the policy of my Government and other Governments which are cooperating with the Government of Kuwait in the military actions. We rejected that fundamentally. If what is meant now by their being in a safe place is that that statement is no longer operative, that is a very good thing, but as I say we will wish to rely on the judgement of the International Committee of the Red Cross as to whether that statement was a correct one or not.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

As to the questions the representative of Iraq put to me, I shall give them careful thought, and I shall certainly be willing to reply to them when this debate resumes next week. However, I do not wish to reply to them off the cuff: they are detailed questions, and he can be sure that I shall address them in due course.

Now, if I could just say a word about the communiqué of the Revolutionary Command Council. The least that could be said about it is that it is not the simple and unconditional affirmative on withdrawal from Kuwait that is needed if this conflict is to be ended. It does indeed contain one tiny gleam of light: the word "withdrawal" has at last reentered the vocabulary of the Government of Iraq. Perhaps before too long the word "Kuwait" will reenter it too - I do admit that the representative of Iraq actually used that word this morning, and I welcome that.

However, the gleam of light in this communiqué is promptly obscured behind a huge bank of conditions, conditions that actually contradict any apparent willingness to accept Security Council resolution 660 (1990). That resolution calls for unconditional withdrawal. Acceptance of it is not, therefore, consistent with the posing of conditions. The list of issues that Iraq tries to link to its withdrawal means that the approval of withdrawal is fundamentally contradictory and flawed.

Now, the representative of Cuba has circulated three draft resolutions, and these will need to be discussed in the usual way. But at first sight I would take the view that two of them are unnecessary and one is unacceptable.

The draft resolution setting up an ad hoc committee of the Council to look into the Gulf crisis is unnecessary because the Council itself is already seized of the matter. What benefit would converting it into a committee bring? Why does the representative of Cuba, who only two days ago was arguing vigorously for an open meeting of the Council, now try to shift the discussion of this issue into a

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

committee from whose deliberations not only the press but the other Members of the United Nations would be excluded? If his delegation has ideas for achieving a peaceful solution in conformity with the Security Council resolutions, why not put them to the Council at its present closed session? We can always suspend this meeting if he needs more time to put forward suggestions.

Then we have the second draft resolution about the use of the Secretary-General's good offices. Again, this is surely unnecessary. Security Council resolution 674 (1990) gives the Secretary-General every encouragement to use his good offices. That provision remains as valid today as the day it was adopted. I have absolute confidence, as does my Government, that if the Secretary-General sees an opportunity to use his good offices he will seize it with both hands. What is needed for that is, among other things, for the Government of Iraq to cease its public campaign of insults and slurs against the Secretary-General - and perhaps the representative of Cuba's Government in Baghdad could use his influence to that end, and so also could the representative of Iraq who is listening to this debate.

Finally, there is a third draft resolution, about the bombing of Iraq. That bombardment is an integral part of the removal of the Iraqi armed forces from Kuwait. All targets are carefully selected, using precision weapons wherever possible, because they pose a threat to coalition forces or because they support Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait. The vast majority of attacks are now taking place in the Kuwait theatre of operations. Where civilian casualties have resulted, this is a source of deep regret, but civilians are not the targets, unlike Iraq's own missile campaign against Saudi Arabia and Israel, which does not achieve a mention in the representative of Cuba's draft resolution.

The way to bring hostilities to an end is for the Iraqi forces to withdraw from Kuwait. Let us hope they do that without more delay.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I want to begin by thanking the representative of Kuwait for his thorough and extremely informative responses to my Government's questions of a few days ago. We are pleased with the responses that he has given.

Our discussions over the past two days have revealed that broad agreement exists among members of the Council, and of the United Nations more generally, on the situation in the Gulf and what remains to be done. We agree that the door to bringing the conflict to an end will open when Iraq begins to comply with the United Nations resolutions.

Friday's statement by Iraq, as we have noted, was discouraging. The announcement yesterday by the Revolutionary Command Council apparently is an acknowledgement of the existence of United Nations resolution 660 (1990), and thus Iraq appears finally to be publicly acknowledging that Kuwait is not its nineteenth province. It is the one, tiny new thing that we have heard - and of course we have just heard from the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait on the value of Iraqi statements and assurances - and we will be following this closely. However, that statement is frankly discouraging in its recital of old and new conditions.

The task of diplomacy is to separate the encouraging from the discouraging. But it still remains for Iraq to confirm that it will withdraw unconditionally and completely from Kuwait. Its statements regrettably demonstrate that it still maintains the hope - indeed, the delusion - that its aggression will in some way be rewarded.

Iraq's clear, continuing lack of concern for the effects of its disastrous policies on its Arab neighbours and on itself defy reason and fill us with deep unease. The statements in this room have confirmed the resolve of the international community to ensure that the resolutions of the Council, international law and the will of the international community be respected.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Given Iraq's intransigence, the best and only way to bring the conflict to the most rapid conclusion possible is to press ahead on all fronts, military and diplomatic. There is no contradiction between the two. Indeed, the increasing pressure on the battlefield must be complemented by increasing efforts to convince Iraq that it must come to terms with reality. The fighting can be brought to a halt, even today or tomorrow, when Iraq decides to do what it must.

We are all aware that the question here is also the future and the credibility of the United Nations and whether it can succeed in stopping aggression through international collective security. The effort to get Iraq out of Kuwait has had overwhelming international support since 2 August. If the effort were to falter the future consequences for international peace and security would be disastrous, but we cannot and we will not falter. Nor will attempts to obfuscate and delay help in bringing the conflict to an end.

A cease-fire without concrete implementation of withdrawal will not accomplish the objectives of resolution 660 (1990) and will not bring the aggression to a close. We are engaged here in a historic contest between two different views of the world and of the future, between a concept of collective security and international obligations, on the one hand, and continued recourse by nations to warfare and aggression by the strong against the weak, on the other hand. This has been clear since 2 August, when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The international community, the Security Council and the General Assembly universally condemned Iraq's actions. Remembering the terrible lessons of the past, we said, clearly and loudly, "No more."

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

But Saddam Hussein counted on the fact that he would prevail against a virtually unarmed neighbour; while tough words and even United Nations-imposed sanctions would persist, the world would eventually come to acquiesce. He believed that while his people would suffer he would win in the end. Indeed, some believe that he thinks he will win precisely because he is willing to see or to make his own people suffer. Judging from the words of the Iraqi representatives, this continues, unfortunately, to be the case.

After 2 August many of us engaged in intensive diplomatic efforts with clear and agreed goals in mind, as set out in the Security Council resolutions. Even as Iraq was attempting systematically to remove the State of Kuwait from the map, we made peaceful attempt after peaceful attempt to convince Iraq that its aggression could not stand, that such blatant aggression and disregard for international law would not be tolerated. We tried to make it clear right up to 15 January that the chance of a peaceful solution still existed.

For its part, the United States emphasized that it wanted to avoid conflict. If Iraq chose the road to peace, Iraq would not be attacked, nor would its forces as they withdrew from Kuwait. We assured Baghdad publicly and privately that the United States had no intention of maintaining a permanent ground presence in the area, and that United States forces would not stay one day longer than necessary to deal with the threat. We affirmed our support for the call in resolution 660 (1990) for Iraq and Kuwait to negotiate their differences peacefully. We said we would consult in the Security Council on the future of the sanctions against Iraq once it had demonstrated compliance with the relevant resolutions, and, while emphasizing that Iraqi withdrawal must be unconditional and complete, we made clear the continuing commitment of the United States to peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours and the Palestinians, and made it clear that in the aftermath of the conflict we would renew our efforts to this end.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

But every one of us who tried over a period of almost six months got nowhere. The six-month effort produced no movement towards a solution, for Saddam Hussein's strategy in this conflict has nothing to do with resolving Iraq's differences with Kuwait. It has nothing to do with settling the problems of the Middle East nor with improving the plight of the Palestinian people or of the poorer peoples of the Arab world. Indeed, one of the great tragedies of this crisis is that Saddam Hussein has made all of those intractable problems more difficult to deal with by his aggression and his hopes to swallow Kuwait.

When all else failed, the coalition against Iraqi aggression acted, as it continues to act, under the authority given it by the Security Council to implement fully the Council's resolutions. Our goals are not grandiose; they are simple and straightforward: to get Iraq out of Kuwait, to restore the legitimate authority of its Government and to restore peace and stability to the area - period, full stop. Those goals will be achieved, certainly not by the United States alone, but by the United States working together under the authority of the United Nations with the coalition partners, Islamic, European, African, Asian and Latin American. Most especially, it will be achieved in cooperation with the other countries of the Middle East, upon which peace, stability and the future of the area must depend.

In keeping with those goals, and because our dispute is not with the Iraqi people but with its leaders, the coalition has from the very outset carefully planned its operations specificially to do all that it can to minimize civilian casualities. The coalition has focused its efforts exclusively on military targets which support Iraq's tremendous war-making potential and hence its ability to occupy Kuwait and maintain its occupation.

It would be irresponsible in the extreme to deal with the huge Iraqi military establishment in Kuwait, which has had six months to dig in and prepare itself, as if it were an isolated entity. No rational effort to remove Iraq from Kuwait could fail to hit the military targets which support and sustain the Iraqi forces in

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Kuwait and provide the offensive power to keep them there. Since 16 January no coalition forces have knowingly or deliberately targeted civilians, their homes or civilian facilities. But unfortunately, despite our best efforts, civilians have been killed or injured. We regret this tremendously. War is a terrible thing, and no civilian deaths in Iraq or Kuwait, or in Saudi Arabia or Israel, are in any sense acceptable. This is an unavoidable consequence of war. We will continue to seek to avoid civilian casualties and we will work to bring the aggression and the conflict it has caused to a close as soon as possible.

Iraq has made the situation worse by deliberately placing military materiel in or near schools or medical facilities or places of worship, in violation of the laws of armed conflict, thereby increasing the risk for its own people. Command-and-control centres in Iraq have been placed on top of schools and public buildings. Coalition aircraft have been fired upon by anti-aircraft weapons scattered among the residential neighbourhoods. In Baghdad anti-aircraft sites have been located on roofs. We have all seen the television pictures. The barrages that those weapons have loosed into the air, shells and missiles, also fall back on the cities, causing damage and casualties. Tanks and artillery and other instruments of war have been placed beside homes in small villages, as have combat aircraft. We have seen the MiG 21 fighters parked next to one of the most important ancient archaeological sites in Iraq, the ziggurat at Ur.

Despite this immoral and illegal policy, we in the coalition continue to do our utmost to avoid civilian casualties and damage, even at the cost of increased risks to our own people. We have for the most part been successful, although the Iraqi Government continues to place its civilians in harm's way, and where we have not been successful it has not been for lack of effort or for lack of trying.

This stands in stark contrast with the terror policy of Iraq, which has launched cold-blooded, indiscriminate attacks on the civilian populations of Saudi Arabia and of Israel, which is not even a party to the conflict. It has been the

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

aim and hope of Iraq precisely to create large numbers of civilian casualties in an effort both to widen and change the nature of the conflict. The fact that it has not been able to do so is due in large part to coalition success in defeating the Iraqi air force and destroying Iraqi Scud missiles and their support structures and to the admirable restraint of the people and the Government of Israel.

Furthermore, Iraq has attempted to win sympathy by fueling concern that major sacred Islamic sites in Iraq have been wantonly attacked by coalition forces, but there is no evidence that any of Iraq's four major holy sites - Karbala, An Najaf, Samarra and Kazimiya - have been damaged by coalition bombing, and we are taking every care to avoid doing so. In fact, we have recent very reliable evidence that they are undamaged and now in normal use. We cannot know whether Iraq is using the same care, since Iraq carefully controls those who might be witnesses.

Looking to a future in which a renewed Iraq plays an important role in the region, I can assure the Council that the coalition has no desire whatsoever to destroy the religious and cultural places of Iraq, just as we have no interest in striking other targets not of military value in the effort to liberate Kuwait.

While there is no doubt about the sincerity of concern for Iraqi civilians and culture, we cannot but be struck by the studied silence in some quarters in the face of the atrocities Iraq has committed against the civilian population of Kuwait. Kuwait has suffered severely since 2 August. Since we met in November to review Iraq's record of abuse, the horror continues. The murder of women, children, the sick and the elderly goes on. Torture and executions continue, as does the ruin of the cities and Kuwait's economic and industrial capacity. Yet no journalist or other outside observer has been allowed by Iraq into Kuwait to witness and report for the world the agony of the Kuwaiti people. Unfortunately, very few journalists have even noted the stark contrast between the controlled reporting from Baghdad and the non-access to Kuwait.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Any delay in bringing about Iraqi withdrawal can only add to the tragic suffering of the Kuwaiti people. And from some quarters we continue to hear concern about the effects of combat on Iraq even as Iraq threatens to use chemical weapons not only against coalition forces but also against the civilian populations in Saudi Arabia and Israel, even as it unleashed a horrible environmental disaster by releasing thousands of tons of oil into the Persian Gulf, doing incalculable damage that will take years to undo and exact costs for generations to come to pay, and even as Iraq flouts the basic provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, refusing to permit access by the International Committee of the Red Cross and parading prisoners of war on television to make obviously forced statements.

We urge the Government of Iraq to put an end to all this suffering and to put Iraq and Kuwait - indeed the whole region - on the road to recovery instead of continuing down the road of destruction. If Iraq persists, the coalition will win the military conflict. Of that, I am certain. But the peace must also be secured, and that is a challenge for all of us, coalition members or not. Every country has a vital stake in seeing to it that the collective effort to restore international legality and peace and security is successful. There must be no reward for Iraq's aggression, if others tempted to brutality and unprovoked attack are to be deterred in the future.

Just as a collective effort is required to defeat the aggressor, so a collective effort will be required to work for justice and security in the future. In such an effort, respect for the sovereignties of the peoples of the Gulf and the Middle East must lie at the heart. It would be absolutely futile for the United States - or indeed any other nation - to think that it can impose its own will or thinking in the Middle East. We join with others in saying that the future of the Gulf region is in the hands of its own people. We look to the States of the Gulf

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

region to take the lead in developing new security arrangements after two major wars in 10 years. No regional State should be excluded, and the United Nations and the rest of the international community have a role in encouraging such arrangements which would prevent further aggression and safeguard the territorial integrity of all States in the area.

We believe that the time has come to deal with arms proliferation and arms control in the region. This includes both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. Right now today, five Middle Eastern nations have more main battle tanks than the United Kingdom or France. At the start of the conflict Iraq had more that both of them together. Iraq has used chemical weapons in war against its own people and is trying to develop biological and nuclear weapons. A destructive pattern of military competition can indeed be changed, and we can and we must work together more effectively to deal with proliferation and to reduce arms flows into the region.

A programme of economic recovery must accompany the effort to improve security. An economic disaster as of yet unknown dimension has occurred in the Gulf, gravely complicated by Iraq's unprecedented environmental terrorism. The people of the Gulf will be paying for a long time the price of Saddam Hussein's policies. Kuwait has been looted and wrecked. Hundreds of thousands of workers have lost their jobs and been dislocated. The Palestinian community in Kuwait alone has been particularly manipulated, vicitimized and exploited by Iraq. Financial and trade systems have been seriously disrupted. The damage done by the Iraqi invasion is enormous, and the confrontation is taking its own awful toll. After the conflict is over, Iraq itself will have to recover from its second disastrous military adventure in 10 years. The United States will want to consult with a broad range of Governments in the Gulf and elsewhere on how to encourage and support such a reconstruction effort. Any long-term effort to secure the peace

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

must rest on economic stability and growth, and Iraq itself must surely be part of that effort.

No sure security in the Middle East is possible without the search for a just peace and real reconciliation involving Israel, the Arab States and the Palestinians. Long-term security requires genuine respect and tolerance, which will be exceedingly difficult to achieve. The sooner Saddam Hussein's tragic aggression is ended, the sooner efforts to resolve these problems can resume. The war has stirred emotions on all sides which it will be hard to calm. But no one has worked harder than the United States for real conciliation and dialogue between Israel and the Palestinians, and we will continue to do so.

As President Bush made clear in his speech before the General Assembly on 1 October last year, in the aftermath of Iraq's unconditional departure from Kuwait, there may be opportunities to settle the conflict that divides Arabs from Israel.

Before I close, I would like to ask the Council to listen to some frank talk. The debate here has contained its charges and its innuendoes. We have all heard them. This is not a war against Muslims or the Iraqi people. It is a battle to turn back aggression. The Muslim people of Kuwait were aggression's first victims. Now Saddam is sacrificing his own people for his own ends - Muslims and Christians and Kurds and people from other groups. This is not a war to dismember, dismantle or destroy Iraq and its population; it is a use of force authorized by this Council to deal with a breach of international peace and security and its aims are clear and directly related to that purpose. This Organization is of course devoted to the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is pledged also to stop the kind of unprovoked aggression committed by Saddam Hussein against a peaceful Member State. When peaceful settlement has not been able to stop aggression, the Charter provides for the use of force by this Council. We have accepted that awesome

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

responsibility and we are here today because we do accept it. This is not a conflict which began on 16 January 1991; it began on 2 August 1990. We may debate its origins, but we cannot ignore the many steps that were taken over five and a half months to resolve it without the use of force.

We are anxious and indeed eager to turn our focus from war to construction, conciliation and cooperation. It is our fervent hope that out of this tragedy can come new prospects for peace in the Gulf region and new prospects for conciliation and solutions in the Middle East as a whole. It is also our hope that this tragedy will confirm the role of the Security Council as a force for collective security in a world in which the recourse to unprovoked aggression becomes evermore unacceptable.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I understood the statement of the representative of Iraq to the effect that the answer to my question will be received by us tomorrow in Moscow from the representative of President Saddam Hussein who will be visiting.

We await that visit with great interest. At that time questions will be asked that have arisen in respect of the statement made by the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq. Moscow expresses the hope that the upcoming talks to be held in Moscow with the representative of the President of Iraq will enable us to move forward to our constant goal: the fulfilment of all the Security Council resolutions.

As for the question put to me by the representative of Iraq, I should like to assure him that not only the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR and the Secretary of State of the United States made in Washington but also the statement made in Helsinki by the Presidents of the two countries, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, remain fully valid.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): Since we now are indeed engaged in a debate, in the proper sense, in the Security Council, I too should like to put a question to the representative of Iraq.

There is no doubt that Security Council resolution 660 (1990) has to be implemented completely, which means in all its parts. Operative paragraph 2 of that resolution has been mentioned very often in the Council. It

"Demands that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990".

Paragraph 3

"Calls upon Iraq and Kuwait to begin immediately intensive negotiations for the resolution of their differences and supports all efforts in this regard, and especially those of the League of Arab States".

If I understood correctly, the representative of Iraq said earlier today that resolution 660 (1990) calls not only for withdrawal but also for immediate and direct negotiations. My question therefore is: Does the statement by the representative of Iraq mean that Iraq is now prepared also to negotiate with Kuwait?

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): I am sorry to have to speak again - this time in connection with a statement made by the representative of Iraq.

The representative of Iraq saw fit to refer to the Turkish military presence in Cyprus. He attempted to draw a parallel with his country's illegal invasion, occupation and annexation of Kuwait. This is a slur, and I am compelled to rectify the statement.

I should like to remind the representative of Iraq that Turkey's intervention in Cyprus was carried out in compliance with international treaties and was in full conformity with international law. I would remind him also that all the

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

inhabitants of the third of Cyprus he referred to are living their daily lives in total freedom, peace and security. Furthermore, these people have been insistent that this protective military presence should continue until a settlement is reached between the two Cypriot peoples. Such a settlement will come, through negotiations now being carried out within the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. Can the representative of Iraq say the same thing about the people of Kuwait now suffering under the heels of the Iraqi occupiers?

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I had asked to speak in order to comment on what was said by the Ambassador of the United Kingdom, but I shall take the opportunity to comment also on what was said by the representative of the United States, and I may say a word or two about what was said by the representative of Turkey.

As for what was said by Sir David, my aim was to give the best possible answers to his questions. I should like to emphasize to him that the Iraqi Government did not reject the request by the International Committee of the Red Cross. There are ongoing communications designed to enable the Red Cross to see the prisoners who are now in the hands of the Iraqi authorities.

I should like to refer particularly to one part of Sir David's statement. He used the word "foolish". I protest his use of that word. He is not a third-rate diplomat: he is an excellent, a first-class diplomat. I do not think he really believes that in our statements we should go as low as that. If he repeats the word, I reserve my right to use it against him.

I turn now to what was said by the representative of the United States of America. His country's position vis-à-vis the statement of the Revolutionary Command Council yesterday shows that the United States is not interested in peace

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

and does not care for the resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 660 (1990), which Iraq said it was ready to deal with.

In fact, the United States does not really care about Kuwait. When the Iran-Iraq war had ended and peace had begun to be established between the two countries, the United States saw fit to wage an aggressive campaign against Iraq in order to destroy it, in order to ensure that Iraq would not remain a deterrent force against the Zionist aggression against the Arab States.

As for the crocodile tears the United States representative shed about civilians, and his statement that the United States does not intentionally bomb civilians, my answer is very simple: The way the air raids are carried out - the intensive, continuous, comprehensive air raids from very high altitudes - makes it extremely difficult to distinguish, and the Americans should know in advance they will not be able to distinguish, between civilian and military, between doctors and policemen, between mosques and military installations. American television networks have shown the oldest Chaldean church, in northern Iraq - very close to the oldest archeological centre: Nineveh - which was bombed by B-52 aircraft.

I cannot think of any time when the United States has admitted that it has not respected the Geneva Conventions - despite the fact that it has waged many wars since the Second World War, including those against Panama, Nicaragua and Viet Nam. The United States never admits that any mistakes have been committed by its forces, although we know of the brutal crimes they have engaged in.

Now the United States is presenting us with new terminology. Now it says it has information that Iraq is placing its military facilities among civilians and in the cities, and that this is why they have to bomb them. I should like to ask this: How can any country at war hide tanks or anti-aircraft weapons in a mosque or a church? This is all nonsense.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

If Iraq has put some of its air defences in certain civilian buildings, that is legitimate because we are engaged in defence.

They are reminding us of catch-22. They say there are weapons among the civilian population and that is why they have to bomb them. That is the American way. But I should like to emphasize to him that Iraq hopes the United States will be sincere and respond to truly peaceful initiatives and work for the establishment of peace in the entire Middle East region instead of exploiting the so-called Gulf crisis to try and destroy an Arab country that represents the heart of the Arab homeland.

As for what has been said by my colleague from Turkey, I am glad to hear that the Cypriot Muslim people in the land occupied by Turkey live in security and peace. That is what we all want. But the fact remains that the presence of the Turkish forces in Cyprus contravenes resolutions of the Security Council calling on Turkey to withdraw them. For more than 20 years Turkey has not implemented those resolutions. That is a fact he did not address.

As for the questions of my colleague the Ambassador of Austria, who is a man of law, I would be glad to answer them at the first opportunity.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Cyprus. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. EFTYCHIOU (Cyprus): It was not my intention to speak in connection with the item on the Council's agenda. Nevertheless, under the circumstances, and due to the eagerness of the representative of Turkey to attempt to give interpretations in connection with the Cyprus problem, I feel obliged to set the record straight, without wanting to indulge in acrimony.

No matter how the representative of Turkey wishes to portray the question of Cyprus, there are certain facts that defy any challenge, paramount among them the fact that Turkey, whatever it may choose to call its invasion, has used military

(Mr. Eftychiou, Cyprus)

force upon a weak neighbour for the purpose of implementing its political volitions and objectives.

What the situation is, and how it stands, is not a secret, especially to this body, which has on numerous occasions through its resolutions taken a clear stand on Cyprus. The only outstanding issue is their implementation and the continued Turkish refusal to honour and implement them.

In this connection we would like once again to take the opportunity to call upon Turkey to honour its obligations and the Security Council resolutions and to cooperate constructively for their full implementation in Cyprus as well as other places.

Mr. PICKERING (United States): The representative of Iraq has made a number of statements, and I will of course want to study the record of today's proceedings and the previous proceedings. I hope I will have an opportunity to reply as appropriate in due course.

I join with my colleague from the United Kingdom in wanting to assure that the Government of Iraq does everything possible to validate what I take to be at least the first effort on his part to indicate a willingness to abide by the Conventions related to prisoners of war.

Secondly, if he is planning to return to Baghdad in the immediate future I will certainly be glad to provide him with the locations of the places where he can find tanks, artillery and aircraft parked in or near civilian places of activity, including the location of a place I have already named where in recent days aircraft have been parked next to Iraq's most important and most famous archaelogical monument.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I do not wish to make a statement or to participate in this debate, though I reserve my right to express the viewpoint of the Republic of Yemen on subjects dealt with at this

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

meeting, in particular in the statement of the representative of the United States, in which he dealt widely with the powers of the Council and the relationship between the current hostilities and the resolutions of the Council and the objectives of these operations, as well as the expected peace and the way a security system would be established in the region on the basis of the principles laid down by the United Nations.

I asked to speak to read out to the Council a statement issued by the Presidential Council in reaction to the proposal made by Iraq, in which it indicated its readiness to deal with resolution 660 (1990), including withdrawal.

The text of the statement is as follows:

"The Presidential Council of the Republic of Yemen, welcoming the communiqué issued by the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council, pays high tribute to this historic position taken by the Iraqi leadership on the basis of which it has indicated its readiness to abide by Security Council resolution 660 (1990) in return for a commitment by the coalition forces to an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of their forces from the region as well as a commitment by the international community to implement the Security Council resolutions relevant to the question of the Palestinian Arab people and the occupied Arab territories.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

"The Presidential Council, while expressing its appreciation for this courageous national resolve, pays tribute to the steadfastness of the brotherly people of Iraq. It calls upon the Security Council urgently to adopt a resolution providing for an immediate cessation of all hostilities. It calls upon all the leaders of Arab and Islamic countries, as well as all peace-loving peoples, to shoulder their historical responsibilities and to take the initiative towards a comprehensive peace in the region, including the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the legitimate national rights of the Arab Palestinian people.

"The Presidential Council also calls on the Arab States cooperating or allied with the foreign forces waging their unjust war against brotherly Iraq to respond to the calls of pan-Arabism and Islam and to their national duty by preventing all the forces mobilized on the front from participating in any military action against Iraqi forces, and by not permitting the allied forces aligned against Iraq to use their territory, airspace or territorial waters for the launching of any attacks against the Iraqi people, their facilities, infrastructure or armed forces.

"The Presidential Council sincerely hopes that all will respond to the call of reason, wisdom and logic to stop the bloodshed and to safeguard the potential of our nation."

A statement was issued by an official source concerning the bombardment of the shelter and the human losses resulting therefrom:

"The leadership, people and Government of the Republic of Yemen are deeply shocked and saddened at the tragedy that led to the martyrdom of hundreds of women, children and the elderly in brotherly Iraq as a result of the horrible attack against a shelter filled with innocent civilians.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

"The Republic of Yemen, while deploring and condemning this carnage and the policy of genocide pursued by the United States of America and its allies in brotherly Iraq, reiterates that the path of peace is the only way to resolve the crisis. The Republic of Yemen reaffirms that the barbaric acts taking place today, including the bombardment of shelters, houses of worship, schools, kindergartens and other civilian facilities by United States and allied forces, not only exceed the resolutions of the Security Council but also run counter to all religions and international conventions.

"The responsibility for the cessation of these inhuman acts falls squarely on the shoulders of the States that have voted for the adoption of Security Council resolution 678 (1990). This was pointed out at that time by the Republic of Yemen, when it spoke of this resolution unleashing the United States and giving it and its allies free reign to destroy the economic, cultural and scientific infrastructure of Iraq".

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Zimbabwe.

The month of January was a particularly difficult and trying period for this Council. My predecessor, Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya of Zaire, guided the affairs of the Council with rare skill and effectiveness. Zimbabwe congratulates him for his sterling efforts, which greatly facilitated the Council's work.

Yesterday, the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq issued a statement which appears to indicate a change in Iraq's position regarding its withdrawal from Kuwait. Zimbabwe considers the statement to be of significance and importance. The Security Council should take this new development seriously. There are many elements which need to be clarified. Zimbabwe expects this Council to start without delay the process of diplomatic exploration with a view to seizing the opportunity for peace which the new development might offer. The gravity of the

(The President)

situation in the Gulf demands that the Council act sensitively and expeditiously. We cannot afford to let even the slightest opportunity for peace slip through our fingers.

Zimbabwe stands ready to work with all those who may have initiatives that would enable this Council to pursue and take full advantage of this new development.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I have a request from a Council member to speak at a later stage. With the concurrence of members of the Council, I shall suspend the meeting now until Tuesday, 19 February, 1991. The time of the meeting will be communicated by the Secretariat.

The meeting was suspended at 2.30 p.m.